

1 THE HONORABLE BARBARA J. ROTHSTEIN  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

8 MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.  
9 COUNTY, et al.,

10 Plaintiffs,  
11 vs.

12 SCOTT TURNER in his official capacity  
13 as Secretary of the U.S. Department of  
Housing and Urban Development, et al.,

14 Defendants.

No. 2:25-cv-00814-BJR

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'  
THIRD MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

[PROPOSED]

15 This matter came before the Court on Plaintiffs' Third Motion for Preliminary Injunction  
16 (the "Motion"). Having considered the briefs and declarations submitted in support of and in  
17 opposition to the Motion and the other pleadings and papers filed in this action, the Court makes  
18 the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

20 **I. FINDINGS OF FACT**

21 **A. The HUD Grant Conditions**

22 1. The "HUD Plaintiffs"<sup>1</sup> have received, currently receive, or are otherwise eligible

24  
25  
26  
27  
<sup>1</sup> The "HUD Plaintiffs" are Martin Luther King, Jr. County ("King County"), Pierce County,  
Snohomish County, City and County of San Francisco ("San Francisco"), County of Santa Clara  
("Santa Clara"), City of Boston ("Boston"), City of Bend ("Bend"), City of Columbus  
("Columbus"), City of New York ("NYC"), City of Cambridge ("Cambridge"), City of Chicago  
("Chicago"), City of Culver City ("Culver City"), King County Regional Homelessness  
Authority ("KCRHA"), City of Minneapolis ("Minneapolis"), Metropolitan Government of  
ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' THIRD MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION - 1

1 to receive federal grants administered by Defendant U.S. Department of Housing and Urban  
 2 Development (HUD), including but not limited to grants administered by HUD through its  
 3 program offices. Collectively, HUD Plaintiffs rely on over \$2.5 billion in appropriated federal  
 4 funds from HUD grant programs, which fund homelessness assistance, affordable housing,  
 5 community development programs, and other services that benefit their communities.  
 6

7       2.      A number of HUD Plaintiffs rely on federal funding from the Continuum of Care  
 8 (CoC) program established by Congress to provide critical services to individuals and families  
 9 experiencing homelessness, including but not limited to rapid rehousing, permanent supportive  
 10 housing, and other services. Of these, several Plaintiffs obtained relief from the challenged grant  
 11 conditions as to the CoC program in this Court's order granting Plaintiffs' prior preliminary  
 12 injunction (PI) motions (the "Initial CoC Plaintiffs"),<sup>2</sup> Dkt. # 169, while others are not covered by  
 13 that order (the "New CoC Plaintiffs," and, together with the Initial CoC Plaintiffs, the "CoC  
 14

15  
 16  
 17  
 18 Nashville & Davidson County ("Nashville"), City of Pasadena ("Pasadena"), Pima County, City  
 19 of Pittsburgh ("Pittsburgh"), City of Portland ("Portland"), City of San José ("San José"), City of  
 20 Santa Monica ("Santa Monica"), Santa Monica Housing Authority ("Santa Monica HA"), City of  
 Tucson ("Tucson"), County of Alameda ("Alameda County"), City of Albuquerque  
 21 ("Albuquerque"), Mayor and City Council of Baltimore ("Baltimore"), City of Bellevue  
 ("Bellevue"), City of Bellingham ("Bellingham"), City of Bremerton ("Bremerton"), County of  
 22 Dane ("Dane County"), City of Eugene ("Eugene"), County of Hennepin ("Hennepin County"),  
 Kitsap County, City of Los Angeles ("Los Angeles"), City of Milwaukee ("Milwaukee"),  
 23 Multnomah County, City of Oakland ("Oakland"), City of Petaluma ("Petaluma"), Ramsey  
 County, City of Rochester ("Rochester"), County of San Mateo ("San Mateo County"), City of  
 24 San Diego ("San Diego"), County of San Mateo ("San Mateo County"), City of Santa Rosa  
 ("Santa Rosa"), County of Sonoma ("Sonoma County"), City of Watsonville ("Watsonville"),  
 Culver City Housing Authority ("CCHA"), and Sonoma County Community Development  
 25 Corporation ("SCCDC").  
 26

<sup>2</sup> The "Initial CoC Plaintiffs" are King County, Pierce County, Snohomish County, San  
 Francisco, Santa Clara, Boston, NYC, Cambridge, KCRHA, Nashville, Pasadena, Pima County,  
 San José, Santa Monica HA, and Tucson.

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' THIRD MOTION FOR  
 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION - 2

No. 2:25-cv-00814-BJR

PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP  
 401 UNION STREET  
 SUITE 1600  
 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-2668  
 TELEPHONE: (206) 245-1700  
 FACSIMILE: (206) 245-1750

1 Plaintiffs").<sup>3</sup>

2       3. All HUD Plaintiffs also rely on a range of other competitive and formula grant  
 3 programs administered by HUD, including but not limited to the Community Development Block  
 4 Grant (CDBG) program, which provides flexible funding for development projects tailored to local  
 5 needs; the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) program, which funds emergency shelters and  
 6 homelessness services; the Home Investment Partnerships (HOME) program, which supports  
 7 development of affordable housing; and the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS  
 8 (HOPWA) program, which funds housing for individuals with HIV/AIDS.

9

10      a.) ***The CoC Grant Conditions***

11       4. In July 2024, HUD posted a biennial Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO),  
 12 inviting applications from local coalitions, known as “Continuums,” for CoC funding. None of the  
 13 conditions challenged here were included in the NOFO. Rather, the NOFO specified that “HUD  
 14 is emphasizing system and program changes to address racial equity within CoCs and projects”  
 15 and instructed applicants that “[r]esponses to preventing and ending homelessness should address  
 16 racial inequities.” The NOFO further specified that each “CoC should address the needs of  
 17 LGBTQ+, transgender, gender non-conforming, and non-binary individuals and families in their  
 18 planning processes,” and “when considering which projects to select in their local competition to  
 19 be included in their application to HUD, CoCs should ensure that all projects provide privacy,  
 20 respect, safety, and access regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation.”

21       5. After reviewing applications, HUD conditionally awarded the New CoC Plaintiffs  
 22 and their Continuums nearly two hundred million dollars in CoC grants in Fiscal Year 2024. New  
 23

---

24       25  
 26       27      <sup>3</sup> The “New CoC Plaintiffs” are Alameda County, Albuquerque, Baltimore, Columbus, Dane  
 County, Hennepin County, Milwaukee, Multnomah County, Oakland, Petaluma, Ramsey  
 County, San Mateo County, and Sonoma County.

CoC Plaintiffs rely on CoC funding, which is typically awarded annually in relatively stable amounts, to provide essential services to their most vulnerable residents, including but not limited to rapid rehousing for those who become suddenly homeless, temporary and permanent supportive housing, rental assistance, mental health services, case management, and more.

6. HUD regulations permit HUD to require CoC recipients to comply with additional “terms and conditions,” but such terms and conditions must be “establish[ed] by NOFA,” which is a term interchangeable with NOFO.

7. Beginning in March 2025, HUD began presenting New CoC Plaintiffs with CoC grant agreements (“CoC Agreements”) containing grant conditions (“CoC Grant Conditions”) that were not included in the NOFO or authorized by any statute or regulation and that are identical to the conditions this Court enjoined as to the Initial CoC Plaintiffs, specifically:

a. The CoC Agreements state that “[t]his Agreement, the Recipient’s use of funds provided under this Agreement . . . , and the Recipient’s operation of projects assisted with Grant Funds” are “governed by” not only certain specified statutes, rules, and grant-related documents, but also by “all current Executive Orders . . . .”

b. The CoC Agreements require the recipient to certify “it does not operate any programs that violate any applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.” The CoC Agreements also require the recipient to agree that “its compliance in all respects with all applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws is material to the U.S. Government’s payment decisions” for purposes of the False Claims Act (FCA), 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729 et seq.

President Donald J. Trump, HUD, and other agencies have confirmed their agenda is to prohibit policies or programs promoting inclusion for people of all races,

1 ethnicities, national origins, sexes, gender identities, or sexual orientations through the  
 2 guise of enforcing federal nondiscrimination law. For instance, Deputy U.S. Attorney  
 3 General Todd Blanche recently announced a new initiative to use the FCA against  
 4 federal-funding recipients that engage in purportedly “unlawful discrimination” via  
 5 DEI policies, which he asserts, without citation to supporting authority, includes  
 6 permitting transgender individuals to use bathrooms or participate in athletics  
 7 consistent with their gender identities. Dkt. # 65 at 5. U.S. Attorney General Pam  
 8 Bondi’s recent memorandum—which states, among other claims, that facially neutral  
 9 practices selected to increase racial diversity are unlawful if “they correlate with,  
 10 replicate, or are used as substitutes for protected characteristics”—further demonstrates  
 11 the Trump administration’s reinterpretation of nondiscrimination law, which  
 12 Defendants intend to enforce against recipients of federal funds. Dkt. # 331. HUD  
 13 Secretary Scott Turner has announced that his agency “is carrying out President  
 14 Trump’s executive orders, mission, and agenda,” by “[a]lign[ing] all . . . grant  
 15 agreements with the President’s Executive Orders, removing diversity, equity,  
 16 inclusion (DEI).” Press Release, HUD, *HUD Delivers Mission-Minded Results in*  
 17 *Trump Administration’s First 100 Days* (Mar. 11, 2025),  
 18 <https://www.hud.gov/news/hud-no-25-059>. He also posted on X (formerly Twitter),  
 19 alongside a screenshot of a version of the CoC Discrimination Condition, stating that  
 20 “CoC funds . . . will not promote DEI.” Scott Turner (@SecretaryTurner), X (Mar. 13,  
 21 2025, 11:47 AM), <https://x.com/SecretaryTurner/status/1900257331184570703>.  
 22 Finally, as discussed further below, HUD recently amended its Applicant and Recipient  
 23 Assurances and Certifications (the “HUD Certifications”), which applicants must  
 24

1 submit to apply for HUD funding, adding a new requirement that applicants must  
 2 certify they do not operate DEI programs that purportedly “violate any applicable  
 3 Federal antidiscrimination laws.” These announcements and updated certification  
 4 requirements reflect the administration’s agenda to pressure recipients to eliminate  
 5 lawful DEI policies using the threat of FCA enforcement based on a legally  
 6 unsupported reinterpretation of nondiscrimination law. *See also* Dkt. # 6 at 346 (letter  
 7 from DOT Secretary Sean Duffy warning that DOT considers “discriminatory policies  
 8 or practices designed to achieve so-called ‘diversity, equity, and inclusion’ . . . goals”  
 9 to “presumptively violate[] Federal law,” even when “described in neutral terms”).

10  
 11 c. Next, the CoC Agreements provide that “[n]o state or unit of general local  
 12 government that receives funding under this grant may use that funding in a manner  
 13 that by design or effect facilitates the subsidization or promotion of illegal immigration  
 14 or abets policies that seek to shield illegal aliens from deportation.”

15  
 16 d. The CoC Agreements further require the recipient to comply with  
 17 “applicable requirements that HUD, the Attorney General, or the U.S. Center for  
 18 Immigration Services [sic] may establish from time to time to comply with PRWORA,  
 19 Executive Order 14218, other Executive Orders or immigration laws.”

20  
 21 e. The CoC Agreements also provide:

22  
 23 Subject to the exceptions provided by PRWORA, the recipient must  
 24 use [the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE)  
 25 system], or an equivalent verification system approved by the  
 26 Federal government, to prevent any Federal public benefit from  
 27 being provided to an ineligible alien who entered the United States  
 illegally or is otherwise unlawfully present in the United States.

28  
 29 f. The CoC Agreements require the recipient to agree it “shall not use grant  
 30 funds to promote ‘gender ideology,’ as defined in [Executive Order] 14168.”

g. The CoC Agreements prohibit the recipient from using grant funds “to fund or promote elective abortions, as required by [Executive Order] 14182, Enforcing the Hyde Amendment.”

8. The CoC Grant Conditions are in tension with, if not violative of, HUD's own regulations. For example, HUD regulations mandate "equal access" to CoC "programs, shelters, other buildings and facilities, benefits, services, and accommodations . . . in accordance with [each] individual's gender identity, and in a manner that affords equal access to the individual's family," including facilities with "shared sleeping quarters or shared bathing facilities." 24 C.F.R. § 5.106(b)-(c). HUD regulations also prohibit subjecting an individual "to intrusive questioning or" asking individuals "to provide anatomical information or documentary, physical, or medical evidence of the individual's gender identity." *Id.* § 5.106(b)(3). HUD's Secretary, Defendant Scott Turner, has said HUD will no longer enforce these regulations, but they remaining in effect and applicable to the CoC program.

9. On May 7, 2025, this Court entered a TRO enjoining Defendants HUD and Scott Turner from, among other things, imposing or enforcing the CoC Grant Conditions, rescinding or canceling the CoC Agreements or withholding funds based on such conditions, or requiring any “certification” or representation related to the those conditions with respect to the original group of CoC Plaintiffs.<sup>4</sup> Dkt. ## 51, 52. On May 21, 2025, this Court extended the TRO for 14 days. Dkt. # 73. On May 21, 2025, Plaintiffs filed their First Amended Complaint, naming additional Plaintiffs affected by the CoC conditions. The Court entered a second TRO on May 23, 2025, extending the relief granted in the first TRO to Plaintiffs Cambridge and Pasadena and their

<sup>4</sup> Plaintiffs King County, Pierce County, Snohomish County, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Boston, and NYC joined the First Motion for TRO as to the CoC Conditions. Dkt. # 5.

1 Continuums as to the CoC Grant Conditions. Dkt. # 152.

2 10. On June 3, 2025, this Court entered a PI enjoining HUD and its officers and agents  
 3 from taking any of the actions barred by the earlier TROs or taking certain other actions  
 4 implementing the CoC conditions with respect to the Initial CoC Plaintiffs. Dkt. # 169.

5 11. Plaintiffs filed their Second Amended Complaint on July 10, 2025, which, among  
 6 other things, added New CoC Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs then filed this Motion seeking, among other  
 7 things, to extent the preliminary relief granted in the first PI Order as to the CoC Grant Conditions  
 8 to the New CoC Plaintiffs. The Initial CoC Plaintiffs and New CoC Plaintiffs assert the same  
 9 claims and allege materially similar harms with respect to the CoC Grant Conditions.

10 12. For similar reasons to those stated in the first PI order, the New CoC Plaintiffs face  
 11 immediate and irreparable harms during the pendency of this litigation absent a PI. The New HUD  
 12 Plaintiffs have an immediate need to receive CoC funds to sustain ongoing programs and services  
 13 and are faced with the choice of losing these funds or accepting conditions that are likely unlawful.  
 14 The HUD Plaintiffs have begun budgeting and planning for upcoming expenditures; households  
 15 reliant on private rentals are at risk of eviction if there is even a short-term interruption of rent  
 16 payments covered by CoC funds; and the interruption of funds could threaten the operation of  
 17 supportive housing. Ultimately, any delay or loss of funding would result in disruption of services  
 18 and cause irreparable damage to individuals' lives. For example:

19 a. The loss of CoC funding would likely lead to the eviction and homelessness  
 20 of hundreds of individuals living in permanent supportive housing or reenrolled in rapid  
 21 rehousing programs in Sonoma County while eliminating services that allow them to  
 22 live safely in the community.

23 b. Similarly, withholding CoC funds from Ramsey County would risk the loss  
 24

1 of access to housing and supportive services to individuals experiencing homelessness,  
 2 increasing their potential exposure to Minnesota's dangerously cold winter weather.

3       c.     Losing CoC funding would not only result in the loss of critical services for  
 4 Multnomah County's homeless residents, including mental health services, case  
 5 management, food, and child care services, it would also put at risk 100 full time  
 6 positions at nonprofit services providers that are exclusively funded with CoC grants.

7       d.     Without CoC funds, Dane County has no source of funding to support 123  
 8 households enrolled in rental assistance programs. Without this assistance, these  
 9 households would be unlikely to afford housing, leading to likely eviction and return  
 10 to homelessness.

12       ***b.) The Non-CoC HUD Grant Conditions***

13       13.    Since the Court entered the PI order, it has become clear that HUD intends to  
 14 impose conditions materially identical to the CoC Grant Conditions on all grant programs HUD  
 15 administers, and at multiple stages of the grant-making process. HUD Plaintiffs rely on these  
 16 grants to fund essential services, including homeless shelters, affordable housing, community  
 17 development projects, and more. Some HUD Plaintiffs coordinate their administration of certain  
 18 HUD grants as members of a "consortium," i.e., "[a]n organization of geographically contiguous  
 19 units of general local government that are acting as a single unit of general local government for  
 20 purposes" of certain HUD programs. 24 C.F.R. § 91.5.

21       24.    In May 2025, HUD amended the HUD Certifications to add a new certification that  
 22 requires applicants to certify that they:

23                   Will not use Federal funding to promote diversity, equity, and  
 24 inclusion (DEI) mandates, policies, programs, or activities that  
 25 violate any applicable Federal antidiscrimination laws.

1 (the “HUD DEI Certification”). Jurisdictions must submit the HUD Certifications to apply for  
 2 HUD funding, including when they submit certain consolidated plans and/or action plans  
 3 annually as a condition to receiving CDBG, ESG, HOME, and HOPWA formula funding.  
 4

5       15. On June 5, 2025, HUD announced additional conditions applicable to all formula  
 6 grants administered by HUD’s Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD), including  
 7 but not limited to the CDBG, ESG, HOME, and HOPWA programs. In particular, a letter by  
 8 Claudette Fernandez, HUD’s General Deputy Assistant Secretary for CPD, lists the following  
 9 conditions that will apply “[u]nder the FY 2025 grant agreement[s]” (collectively, and together  
 10 with the HUD DEI Certification, the “Non-CoC HUD Grant Conditions”):

11           a.       First, recipients must agree that they “shall not use grant funds to  
 12 promote ‘gender ideology,’ as defined in Executive Order (E.O.) 14168, Defending  
 13 Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the  
 14 Federal Government” (the “CPD Gender Ideology Condition”).  
 15

16           b.       Second, each recipient must “agree[] that its compliance in all respects with  
 17 all applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws is material to the U.S. Government’s  
 18 payment decisions for purposes of [the FCA]” and “certif[y] that it does not operate  
 19 any programs that violate any applicable Federal antidiscrimination laws, including  
 20 Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964” (together, the “CPD Discrimination  
 21 Condition”). President Trump, HUD, and other agencies have confirmed their agenda  
 22 is to prohibit policies or programs promoting inclusion for people of all races,  
 23 ethnicities, national origins, sexes, gender identities, or sexual orientations through the  
 24 guise of enforcing federal nondiscrimination law. Under that agenda the operation of  
 25 any DEI program would run afoul of the certification.  
 26

c. Third, each recipient must agree that it “shall not use any grant funds to fund or promote elective abortions, as required by E.O. 14182, Enforcing the Hyde Amendment” (the “CPD Abortion Condition”).

d. Fourth, recipients must agree that:

The Grantee must administer its grant in accordance with all applicable immigration restrictions and requirements, including the eligibility and verification requirements that apply under [PRWORA] and any applicable requirements that HUD, the Attorney General, or the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services may establish from time to time to comply with PRWORA, Executive Order 14218, or other Executive Orders or immigration laws.

Unless excepted by PRWORA, the Grantee must use SAVE, or an equivalent verification system approved by the Federal government, to prevent any Federal public benefit from being provided to an ineligible alien who entered the United States illegally or is otherwise unlawfully present in the United States.

(together, the “CPD Verification Condition”).

e. Fifth, the recipient must agree that:

If applicable, no state or unit of general local government that receives funding under this grant may use that funding in a manner that by design or effect facilitates the subsidization or promotion of illegal immigration or abets policies that seek to shield illegal aliens from deportation.

(the “CPD Enforcement Condition”).

16. Further demonstrating the agency’s intent to apply the Non-CoC HUD Conditions to all HUD grant programs, in April 2025, HUD updated its General Administrative, National, and Departmental Policy Requirements and Terms for HUD’s Financial Assistance Programs (the “HUD Policy Terms”) to list President Trump’s executive orders among the “laws and policies that may apply” to HUD grants and to list requirements materially similar or identical to certain

1 Non-CoC HUD Grant Conditions.

2       17. The Non-CoC HUD Grant Conditions are in tension with, if not violative of,  
 3 congressional guidance and directives governing HUD grant programs. For instance, the HOME  
 4 Investment Partnerships Act, Pub. L. No. 101-625, tit. II, 104 Stat. 4079, 4094, which established  
 5 the HOME program requires participating jurisdictions “to establish and oversee a minority  
 6 outreach program . . . to ensure the inclusion, to the maximum extent possible, of minorities and  
 7 women, and entities owned by minorities and women . . . in all contracts[] entered into by the  
 8 participating jurisdiction . . . to provide affordable housing authorized under this Act.” 42 U.S.C.  
 9 § 12831(a). In addition, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, Pub. L. 93-383,  
 10 88 Stat. 633, which established the CDBG program, requires the HUD Secretary to set aside some  
 11 of the funds appropriated for the CDBG program for “special purpose grants,” which may include,  
 12 among other things, grants to “historically Black colleges.” 42 U.S.C. § 5307(b)(2). Of the  
 13 amounts set aside for special purpose grants, the Secretary “shall” make grants to institutions of  
 14 higher education “for the purpose of providing assistance to economically disadvantaged and  
 15 minority students who participate in community development work study programs and are  
 16 enrolled in” qualifying degree programs. *Id.* § 5307(c). Finally, of the Cranston-Gonzalez National  
 17 Affordable Housing Act, Pub. L. No. 101-625, 104 Stat. 4079, which established the HOME and  
 18 HOPWA programs, indicates congressional intent to benefit historically disadvantaged groups,  
 19 including the aim to “improve housing opportunities for . . . members of disadvantaged  
 20 minorities.” 42 U.S.C. § 12702(3).

21       18. HUD Plaintiffs face immediate and irreparable harms from imposition of the Non-  
 22 CoC HUD Grant Conditions during the pendency of this litigation absent a PI. Many HUD  
 23 Plaintiffs face a deadline of Saturday, August 16, 2025, to submit consolidated and action plans to  
 24

1 HUD, which would subject them to the Non-CoC HUD Grant Conditions, or else forfeit formula  
 2 grant funding needed to support essential services. And HUD has recently informed King County  
 3 that its consolidated/action plan was being disapproved based on its use of words like “equity” and  
 4 “migrant” that HUD deemed to violate requirements set forth in executive orders. HUD directed  
 5 King County to remove these words from its plans and include “assurance statements” that mirror  
 6 the Non-CoC HUD Grant Conditions. Other Plaintiffs, including Petaluma and Bellevue have  
 7 received similar notifications.

9 19. HUD Plaintiffs are already grappling with the uncertainty over federal funding by,  
 10 for example, pausing affordable housing development and preservation. Loss of these funds would  
 11 disrupt the lives of HUD Plaintiffs’ most vulnerable residents, likely leading to evictions and  
 12 increased homelessness and further straining local resources. Even a temporary loss of funding  
 13 would set back efforts to create and preserve affordable housing, ameliorate homelessness, and  
 14 house low-income individuals living with HIV/AIDS. For example:

16 a. Loss of CDBG, HOME, and ESG funding would eliminate housing  
 17 opportunities for between 200 and 500 low income and homeless residents in San  
 18 Mateo County who rely on housing and shelter programs funding by these grants.

19 b. Withholding HUD funding would place approximately 1,500 households in  
 20 Santa Monica that are currently housed through HOME and other HUD-funded  
 21 programs at immediate risk of homelessness.

23 c. Pierce County has had to pause a project to develop and preserve affordable  
 24 housing due to uncertainty over the Non-CoC HUD Grant Conditions.

25 d. Loss of funding would eliminate Bellingham’s Home Rehabilitation  
 26 Program, which allows elderly and disabled residents the dignity of living safely in

their own homes, and would severely undermine the viability of Bellingham's food bank, on which nearly 20% of the surrounding county's residents rely.

## **B. The DOT Grant Conditions**

20. Many Plaintiffs rely, collectively, on billions of dollars in appropriated funds through grant programs administered by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and its operating administrations, which include but are not limited to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (collectively, the “DOT OAs,” and together with Defendants DOT, Sean Duffy, Tariq Bokhari, Gloria M. Shepherd, Chris Rocheleau, and Drew Feeley, the “DOT Defendants”).

21. The “Initial DOT Plaintiffs”<sup>5</sup> obtained relief from the challenged grant conditions in this Court’s order granting Plaintiffs’ prior preliminary injunction (PI) motions, Dkt. # 169. Others joined this lawsuit subsequently and are not covered by that order (the “New DOT Plaintiffs,” and, together with the Initial DOT Plaintiffs, the “DOT Plaintiffs”).<sup>6</sup>

22. On April 24, 2025, DOT Secretary Sean Duffy issued a letter to "all recipients" of

<sup>5</sup> The “Initial DOT Plaintiffs” are King County, Bend, Boston, Chicago, Columbus, Culver City, City of Denver (“Denver”), Intercity Transit, Minneapolis, Nashville, NYC, Pierce County, Pima County, Pittsburgh, Port of Seattle (“Seattle”), Portland, San Francisco, San José, Santa Clara, Santa Monica, Snohomish County, Sonoma County, Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority (“Sound Transit”), San Francisco County Transportation Authority (“SFCTA”), Treasure Island Mobility Management Agency (“TIMMA”), Tucson, and City of Wilsonville (“Wilsonville”).

<sup>6</sup> The “New DOT Plaintiffs” are Alameda County, Albuquerque, Baltimore, Bellevue, Bellingham, Bremerton, Cambridge, Dane County, Eugene, City of Healdsburg (“Healdsburg”), Hennepin County, Kitsap County, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, Multnomah County, Oakland, City of Pacifica (“Pacifica”), Pasadena, Petaluma, Puget Sound Regional Council (“PSRC”), Ramsey County, Rochester, City of Rohnert Park (“Rohnert Park”), San Diego, San Mateo County, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County Transportation Authority (“SCTA”), and Watsonville.

1 DOT grant funding announcing, among other things, a DOT “policy” to impose certain conditions  
 2 on all DOT funding, including but not limited to grants administered by DOT and the DOT OAs.  
 3 In particular, Secretary Duffy’s letter states that grant recipients’ “legal obligations require  
 4 cooperation generally with Federal authorities in the enforcement of Federal law, including  
 5 cooperating with and not impeding U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and other  
 6 Federal offices and components of the Department of Homeland Security in the enforcement of  
 7 Federal immigration law.” It also states that DOT interprets federal anti-discrimination law to  
 8 presumptively prohibit “any policy, program, or activity that is premised on a prohibited  
 9 classification, including discriminatory policies or practices designed to achieve so-called  
 10 ‘diversity, equity, and inclusion’ . . . goals.” Finally, the letter states that “DOT recipients are  
 11 prohibited from engaging in discriminatory actions in their own policies, programs, and activities.”  
 12

13       23. Pursuant to the policy set forth in Secretary Duffy’s letter, the DOT Defendants  
 14 began attaching new conditions related to immigration enforcement, executive orders, and  
 15 diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) to DOT-funded grants.

16       24. For instance, several DOT Plaintiffs were previously awarded FTA funds pursuant  
 17 to programs codified in title 49, chapter 53 of the U.S. Code. These funds were awarded without  
 18 any of the conditions challenged here.

19       25. On April 25, 2025, FTA issued a revised Master Agreement, which applies to FTA  
 20 grants awarded to the DOT Plaintiffs. The new Master Agreement contains the following new  
 21 conditions (“FTA Grant Conditions”):

22           a.       The FTA Master Agreement requires the recipient to “agree[] to comply  
 23 with all applicable federal requirements and follow applicable federal guidance.” The  
 24 Master Agreement defines “Federal Requirement” to include “[a]n applicable federal  
 25

1 law, regulation, or executive order.”

2 b. The FTA Master Agreement provides:

3 (1) Pursuant to section (3)(b)(iv)(A) [of Executive Order 14173],  
 4 the Recipient agrees that its compliance in all respects with all  
 5 applicable Federal antidiscrimination laws is material to the  
 6 government’s payment decisions for purposes of [the FCA].

7 (2) Pursuant to section (3)(b)(iv)(B) [of Executive Order 14173], by  
 8 entering into this Agreement, the Recipient certifies that it does  
 9 not operate any programs promoting [DEI] initiatives that  
 10 violate any applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws.

11 While FTA grants have long required compliance with nondiscrimination laws,  
 12 DOT has confirmed its intent to enforce a sweeping interpretation of these  
 13 conditions inconsistent with statutory text and current court interpretations of the  
 14 Federal antidiscrimination laws.

15 c. The FTA Master Agreement also provides:

16 The Recipient . . . will cooperate with Federal officials in the  
 17 enforcement of Federal law, including cooperating with and not  
 18 impeding U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and  
 19 other Federal offices and components of the Department of  
 20 Homeland Security in the enforcement of Federal immigration law.

21 26. This Court’s May 7 TRO enjoined Defendants DOT, FTA, Sean Duffy, and  
 22 Mathew Welbes from, among other things, imposing or enforcing the FTA Grant Conditions,  
 23 rescinding or canceling FTA funds or withholding funds based on such conditions, or requiring  
 24 any “certification” or representation related to those conditions as to King County—the sole  
 25 Plaintiff to initially seek preliminary relief from the FTA Grant Conditions. This aspect of the TRO  
 26 served, in part, to prevent immediate and irreparable harms that King County faced from having  
 27 to choose between accepting likely unlawful conditions or losing hundreds of millions in FTA  
 funding.

1       27. Since then, DOT and the remaining DOT OAs began attaching substantially similar  
 2 conditions to numerous other DOT grants. These include, but are not limited to, programs  
 3 administered by FHWA, such as the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) program, the Federal  
 4 Highway-Aid Program, the Bridge Investment Program, the Culvert Aquatic Organism Passage  
 5 Program, and the Advanced Transportation Technology and Innovation (ATTAIN) program;  
 6 programs administered by FAA, such as the Airport Infrastructure Grants (AIG) program;  
 7 programs administered by FRA, such as the Railroad Crossing Elimination (RCE) Grant Program;  
 8 and programs administered directly by DOT, such as the Strengthening Mobility and  
 9 Revolutionizing Transportation (SMART) discretionary grant program. Moreover, Defendants  
 10 Duffy, DOT, and the DOT OAs have made clear that these conditions will now appear in all DOT  
 11 grants going forward.

12       28. DOT and the remaining DOT OAs have provided grant agreements governing grant  
 13 programs that contain substantially the same three conditions as in the FTA Master Agreement  
 14 (collectively and together with the FTA Grant Conditions, the “DOT Grant Conditions”):

15           a. First, the DOT Defendants have imposed a discrimination condition (“DOT  
 16 Discrimination Condition”) that requires grant recipients, “[p]ursuant to Section  
 17 (3)(b)(iv), Executive Order 14173” to agree that “its compliance in all respects with all  
 18 applicable Federal antidiscrimination laws is material to the government’s payment  
 19 decisions for purposes of [the False Claims Act],” and that “it does not operate any  
 20 programs promoting [DEI] initiatives that violate any applicable Federal anti-  
 21 discrimination laws.”

22           b. Second, the DOT Defendants have imposed an immigration enforcement  
 23 condition (“DOT Immigration Enforcement Condition”) that requires recipients to

1 “cooperate with Federal officials in the enforcement of Federal law, including  
 2 cooperating with and not impeding U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)  
 3 and other Federal offices and components of the Department of Homeland Security in  
 4 the enforcement of Federal immigration law,” and a condition requiring recipients to  
 5 “follow applicable federal laws pertaining to Subchapter 12 and be subject to the  
 6 penalties set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1324, Bringing in and harboring certain aliens, and 8  
 7 U.S.C. § 1327, Aiding or assisting certain aliens to enter.” The Duffy Letter articulates  
 8 DOT’s intent to enforce an expansive and novel interpretation of these statutes, thereby  
 9 forcing local governments to participate in the Trump administration’s aggressive  
 10 immigration enforcement policies. It asserts that “[d]eclining to cooperate with the  
 11 enforcement of Federal immigration law or otherwise taking action intended to shield  
 12 illegal aliens from ICE detection contravenes Federal law and may give rise to civil  
 13 and criminal liability” under “8 U.S.C. § 1324 and 8 U.S.C. § 1373.”

16 c. Third, the DOT Defendants have imposed a condition (“DOT EO  
 17 Condition”) that requires recipients to “comply with all applicable Federal laws,  
 18 regulations, executive orders, policies, guidelines, and requirements as they relate to  
 19 the application, acceptance, and use of Federal funds for this [grant]” and lists, among  
 20 other things, Executive Orders 14168 (“Defending Women from Gender Ideology  
 21 Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government”) and 14173  
 22 (“Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity”), as well as  
 23 two criminal immigration statutes (8 U.S.C. § 1324 and 8 U.S.C. § 1327) as  
 24 “provisions” that are “applicable” to grant agreements.

26 29. The DOT Grant Conditions are in tension with, if not violative of, congressional  
 27

1 guidance and directives and HUD's own regulations. They also contradict guidance contained in  
 2 NOFOs issued by DOT announcing competitions for DOT funds.

3 30. For instance, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, Pub. L. 117-58, 135 Stat.  
 4 429, which established the Safe Streets and Roads for All (“SS4A”) grant program, requires the  
 5 DOT Secretary, in awarding grants, to consider, among other things, the extent to which applicants  
 6 and their proposed projects will ensure “equitable investment in the safety needs of underserved  
 7 communities in preventing transportation-related fatalities and injuries.” Pub. L. 117-58,  
 8 § 24112(c)(3), 135 Stat. 816.

9 31. The DOT Discrimination Condition is in apparent tension with a statutorily  
 10 required grant assurance sponsors must make to receive airport development grants from the FAA.  
 11 In particular, sponsors must assure that they will take necessary action to ensure, to the maximum  
 12 extent possible, that at least 10 percent of all businesses at the airport selling consumer products  
 13 or providing consumer services to the public are small business concerns owned and controlled by  
 14 “a socially and economically disadvantaged individual” or other small business concerns in  
 15 historically underutilized business zones. 49 U.S.C. § 47107(e)(1). “Socially and economically  
 16 disadvantaged individual” is defined to include “Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native  
 17 Americans, Asian Pacific Americans, and other minorities,” as well as women. *Id.* § 47113(a)(2);  
 18 15 U.S.C. § 637(d).

19 32. Many of the general terms and conditions adopted by DOT and its OAs, including  
 20 but not limited to FTA, also require compliance with 2 C.F.R. § 200.321, which states, “[w]hen  
 21 possible, the recipient or subrecipient should ensure that small businesses, minority businesses,  
 22 women’s business enterprises, veteran-owned businesses, and labor surplus area firms” are, *inter*  
 23 *alia*, “included on solicitation lists” and “solicited” when “deemed eligible.” In addition, 49 C.F.R.  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27

1       § 21.5, which prohibits discrimination, states, “[w]here prior discriminatory practice or usage  
 2 tends, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin to exclude individuals from participation in,  
 3 to deny them the benefits of, or to subject them to discrimination under any program or activity . .  
 4 . the applicant or recipient must take affirmative action to remove or overcome the effects of the  
 5 prior discriminatory practice or usage.” 49 C.F.R. § 21.5(b)(7).

7       33.      In February 2024, DOT posted a NOFO, updated in April 2024, announcing a  
 8 competition for SS4A grant funding for Fiscal Year 2024 (the “FY 2024 SS4A NOFO”). The FY  
 9 2024 SS4A NOFO directed applicants to consider policy priorities in their applications, including  
 10 “Equity and Barriers to Opportunity” and “Climate Change and Environmental Justice.” The FY  
 11 2024 SS4A NOFO defined “equity,” which it strongly emphasized throughout, as “[t]he consistent  
 12 and systematic fair, just, and impartial treatment of all individuals, including individuals who  
 13 belong to underserved communities that have been denied such treatment, such as Black, Latino,  
 14 Indigenous and Native Americans, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and other persons of  
 15 color; members of religious minorities; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ+)  
 16 persons; persons with disabilities; persons who live in rural areas; and persons otherwise adversely  
 17 affected by persistent poverty or inequality.”

19       34.      This Court’s May 23 TRO enjoined DOT, the DOT OAs, and their officers and  
 20 agents from taking various actions to impose, enforce, or withhold DOT funds as to Plaintiffs  
 21 Columbus, Intercity Transit, King County, Minneapolis, NYC, Port of Seattle, and Tucson or their  
 22 subrecipients based on the DOT Grant Conditions or materially similar terms or conditions. The  
 23 May 23 TRO also ordered DOT and the DOT OAs to immediately treat any actions taken to  
 24 implement the DOT Grant Conditions against those Plaintiffs, including any delays or withholding  
 25 of funds based on the conditions, as void, and enjoined DOT and the DOT OAs from retroactively  
 26 27

1 applying the conditions to grant agreements during the effective period of the TRO.

2       35. This Court's June 3, 2025 PI enjoined the DOT Defendants from taking any of the  
 3 actions enjoined in the TROs, as well as certain other actions to implement the DOT Grant  
 4 Conditions, with respect to the Initial DOT Defendants. However, the DOT Defendants have  
 5 continued to impose the DOT Grant Conditions on jurisdictions and local agencies that were not  
 6 subject to the PI order, including the New DOT Plaintiffs.

7       36. Plaintiffs Second Amended Complaint added the New DOT Plaintiffs to this  
 8 lawsuit. Plaintiffs then filed this Motion seeking, among other things, to extend the preliminary  
 9 relief granted in the first PI Order as to the DOT Grant Conditions to the New DOT Plaintiffs. The  
 10 Initial DOT Plaintiffs and New DOT Plaintiffs assert the same claims and allege materially similar  
 11 harms with respect to the DOT Grant Conditions.

12       37. For similar reasons to those stated in the first PI order, the New DOT Plaintiffs face  
 13 immediate and irreparable harms during the pendency of this litigation absent a preliminary  
 14 injunction. Any delay or loss of DOT funding would force the DOT Plaintiffs to substantially  
 15 curtail existing and planned transportation safety and other improvement operations, including but  
 16 not limited to enhancing pedestrian and cyclist safety, conducting airport renovations and bridge  
 17 improvements, and maintaining and replacing a range of transit vehicles. In some cases, the DOT  
 18 Plaintiffs need to draw down grant awards immediately or else divert resources from other projects  
 19 or services and face significant project delays. The loss of DOT funding would require the DOT  
 20 Plaintiffs to fundamentally rework their longstanding financial plans and procedures, capital  
 21 project delivery processes, and service delivery models in ways that could have significant impacts  
 22 on their missions, employees, and constituents. Given the significance of the impacts, the  
 23 uncertainty surrounding continued DOT funding is already causing the DOT Plaintiffs harm. To  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27

1 give just a few examples:

- 2 a. Loss of FHWA funding would require Bremerton to immediately cease  
3 work on projects to design improvements to a key corridor to address safety concerns  
4 and provide critical infrastructure upgrades to the region.
- 5 b. Similarly, Rohnert Park would be forced to indefinitely delay an underway  
6 Highway 101 bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing project if FHWA withholds funds,  
7 leaving the City's residents, particularly those in vulnerable and underserved  
8 communities, exposed to hazardous road conditions.
- 9 c. Withholding FAA funding from Milwaukee County would force it to  
10 cancel, delay, or modify—at significantly increased cost—projects to strengthen and  
11 rehabilitate major runways and other key airport infrastructure, impairing the County's  
12 ability to fund capital projects over the long-term.
- 13 d. Even a delay in Pacifica's receipt of DOT funding from grant awards passed  
14 through the State of California would cause disruptions in projects related to public  
15 safety and traffic control that rely on National Highway Traffic Safety Administration  
16 funds.
- 17 e. Loss of FTA funding would place Santa Rosa at risk of falling out of  
18 compliance with FTA regulations and California's zero-emission requirements and  
19 would lead to staffing reductions, service curtailments, reduced maintenance  
20 capabilities in its transit system, and delayed or cancelled infrastructure improvements  
21 intended to serve the disabled and improve safety.

1                   **C. The HHS Grant Conditions**

2                   38. The “HHS Plaintiffs”<sup>7</sup> have received, currently receive, or are otherwise eligible to  
 3 receive federal grants administered by Defendant U.S. Department of Health and Human Services  
 4 (HHS). Collectively, HHS Plaintiffs rely on over \$2 billion in appropriated federal funds from  
 5 HHS grant programs, which fund essential health programs and services, such as child welfare  
 6 assistance, adoption and foster care services, and healthcare for low income individuals and those  
 7 living with HIV/AIDS. These programs are administered by HHS and its operating divisions and  
 8 agencies, including but not limited to the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), the  
 9 Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), the Substance Abuse and Mental Health  
 10 Services Administration (SAMHSA), the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and the Centers for  
 11 Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), among others.

12                   39. Like HUD and DOT, HHS has begun attaching new and similar conditions to grants  
 13 administered by HHS and its operating divisions and agencies, as described below (collectively,  
 14 the “HHS Grant Conditions”).

15                   40. In April 2025, HHS updated its Grants Policy Statement, which applies to  
 16 discretionary grants and is incorporated into awards and certain award modifications after April  
 17 16, 2025. The updated Grants Policy Statement provided:

18                   21 [R]ecipients must comply with all applicable Federal anti-  
 19 discrimination laws material to the government’s payment  
 20 decisions for purposes of 31 U.S.C. § 372(b)(4).

21                   23 (1) Definitions. As used in this clause –  
 22                   24 (a) DEI means “diversity, equity, and inclusion.”

25                   27 <sup>7</sup> The “HHS Plaintiffs” are King County, Pierce County, Snohomish County, Boston, Columbus,  
 26 NYC, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Cambridge, Chicago, Denver, Minneapolis, Wilsonville,  
 27 Alameda County, Baltimore, Cambridge, Dane County, Eugene, Hennepin County, Milwaukee,  
 Multnomah County, Oakland, Pacifica, Pima County, Ramsey County, Rochester, San Mateo  
 County, and Wilsonville.

- (b) DEIA means “diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility.”
- (c) Discriminatory equity ideology has the meaning set forth in Section 2(b) of Executive Order 14190 of January 29, 2025.

• • • •

By accepting the grant award, recipients are certifying that . . .  
[t]hey do not, and will not during the term of this financial assistance award, operate any programs that advance or promote DEI, DEIA, or discriminatory equity ideology in violation of Federal anti-discrimination laws

(together, the “HHS Discrimination Condition”).

41. On July 24, 2025, after Plaintiffs filed the Motion, HHS updated the Grants Policy Statement again (2025 HHS GPS), removing express references to DEI but maintaining that by not only “accepting,” but even “*applying for . . .* federal funds from HHS, recipients certify compliance with all federal antidiscrimination laws and these requirements that complying with those laws is a material condition of receiving federal funding streams.” The 2025 HHS GPS also states that “[r]ecipients are responsible for ensuring subrecipients, contractors, and partners also comply.” The statements referenced above, including by Attorney General Bondi, Deputy Attorney General Blanche, and other federal officials, strongly suggest that HHS intends to enforce the 2025 HHS GPS consistent with the anti-DEI reinterpretation of nondiscrimination law expressed in these statements, notwithstanding the revised language.

42. In addition to these agency-wide conditions, several HHS operating divisions and agencies have issued their own general terms and conditions incorporating the 2025 HHS GPS.

43. ACF has updated its Standard Terms and Conditions, which apply to both discretionary and non-discretionary awards, to add a certification materially identical to the HHS Discrimination Condition, which states:

For *new awards made on or after May 8, 2025*, the following is effective immediately:

Recipients must comply with all applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws material to the government's payment decisions for purposes of [the FCA].

(1) Definitions. As used in this clause –

(a) DEI means “diversity, equity, and inclusion.”

(b) DEIA means “diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility.”

(c) Discriminatory equity ideology has the meaning set forth in Section 2(b) of Executive Order 14190 of January 29, 2025.

(e) Federal anti-discrimination laws means Federal civil rights law that protect individual Americans from discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, and national origin.

(2) Grant award certification.

(a) By accepting the grant award, recipients are certifying that:

(i) They do not, and will not during the term of this financial assistance award, operate any programs that advance or promote the following in violation of Federal anti-discrimination laws: DEI, DEIA, or discriminatory equity ideology.

44. While HHS grants have long required compliance with nondiscrimination laws, President Trump, HHS, and other agencies have confirmed their agenda is to prohibit policies or programs promoting inclusion for people of all races, ethnicities, national origins, sexes, gender identities, or sexual orientations through the guise of enforcing federal nondiscrimination law.

45. Like HHS, ACF updated its Standard Terms and Conditions on July 29, 2025, to remove express references to DEI. But the statements discussed indicated that this revision does not change the intended meaning of the condition or how ACF will enforce it:

1 By applying for or accepting federal funds from HHS,  
 2 recipients certify compliance with all federal  
 3 antidiscrimination laws and these requirements and that  
 4 complying with those laws is a material condition of  
 5 receiving federal funding streams. Recipients are  
 6 responsible for ensuring subrecipients, contractors, and  
 7 partners also comply.

8 46. On May 14, 2025, HRSA issued updated general terms and conditions applicable  
 9 to "all active awards." The revised HRSA terms and conditions incorporate the 2025 HHS GPS  
 10 and also contain the following new provision:

11 By accepting this award, including the obligation, expenditure, or  
 12 drawdown of award funds, recipients, whose programs, are covered  
 13 by Title IX certify as follows:

14 Recipient is compliant with Title IX of the Education Amendments  
 15 of 1972, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 et seq., including the  
 16 requirements set forth in Presidential Executive Order 14168 titled  
 17 Defending Women From Gender Ideology Extremism and  
 18 Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government, and Title VI  
 19 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d et seq., and  
 20 Recipient will remain compliant for the duration of the Agreement.

21 The above requirements are conditions of payment that go the  
 22 essence of the Agreement and are therefore material terms of the  
 23 Agreement.

24 Payments under the Agreement are predicated on compliance with  
 25 the above requirements, and therefore Recipient is not eligible for  
 26 funding under the Agreement or to retain any funding under the  
 27 Agreement absent compliance with the above requirements.

Recipient acknowledges that this certification reflects a change in  
 the government's position regarding the materiality of the foregoing  
 requirements and therefore any prior payment of similar claims does  
 not reflect the materiality of the foregoing requirements to this  
 Agreement.

Recipient acknowledges that a knowing false statement relating to  
 Recipient's compliance with the above requirements and/or  
 eligibility for the Agreement may subject Recipient to liability under  
 the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729, and/or criminal liability,  
 including under 18 U.S.C. §§ 287 and 1001.

1 (the “HRSA Gender Ideology Condition”).

2 47. SAMHSA has also updated its NOFO Application Guide to state that “[a]ll  
3 activities proposed in your application and budget narrative must be in alignment with the current  
4 Executive Orders” (the “SAMHSA EO Condition”).

5 48. On July 29, 2025, SAMHSA also updated its Fiscal Year 2025 Standard Terms and  
6 Conditions (2025 SAMHSA T&Cs). The 2025 SAMHSA T&Cs incorporate the 2025 HHS GPS  
7 and also contain a Title IX condition materially identical to the HRSA Gender Ideology Condition  
8 (“SAMHSA Gender Ideology Condition”). Moreover, the 2025 SAMHSA T&Cs state  
9 “[r]ecipients are required to comply with all applicable Executive Orders” (mirroring the  
10 SAMHSA EO Condition).

12 49. Finally, NIH has issued Notices of Award that contain a condition relating to Title  
13 IX that is substantially identical to the HRSA Gender Ideology Condition (the “NIH Gender  
14 Ideology Condition”).

16 50. The HHS Grant Conditions contradict guidance contained in NOFOs issued by  
17 HHS announcing competitions for HHS funds. For instance, in 2024, CDC issued a NOFO  
18 announcing a competition for grants under the High-Impact HIV Prevention and Surveillance  
19 Programs for Health Departments. The NOFO required applicants to include an element in their  
20 applications “[a]ddressing [s]ocial and [s]tructural [f]actors.” The NOFO further stated that “[t]he  
21 impact of racism, homophobia, transphobia, and stigma significantly exacerbates the health  
22 disparities experienced among communities disproportionately affected by HIV.” Accordingly,  
23 the NOFO explained, “[h]ealth equity is a desirable goal that entails special efforts to improve the  
24 health of those who have experienced social or economic disadvantage.” With respect to  
25 “[p]opulation(s) of [f]ocus,” the NOFO explained that “[a]pplicants must provide HIV services to  
26  
27

1 populations within the jurisdiction that are disproportionately impacted by HIV,” and provided  
 2 “[e]xamples to consider,” including “transgender women, cisgender Black or African American  
 3 women, gay and bisexual men, American Indian or Alaska Native gay and bisexual men, people  
 4 who inject drugs (PWID), youth, pregnant and postpartum persons and their infants, and other  
 5 populations with disproportionately higher rates of HIV diagnosis including individuals involved  
 6 in the justice system and people experiencing housing insecurity.”  
 7

8 51. HHS Plaintiffs face immediate and irreparable harms from imposition of the HHS  
 9 Grant Conditions during the pendency of this litigation absent a PI. Loss of HHS funding would  
 10 force jurisdictions to curtail or terminate essential services, leading many of their most vulnerable  
 11 residents to lose access to food, medical care, child care, and housing, among other critical  
 12 services. The curtailment of services would have wide-reaching public health consequences,  
 13 including but not limited to diminished pandemic preparedness and communicable disease control.  
 14 For example:

16 a. Loss of HRSA funding would cause at least 75 low income individuals  
 17 living in King County with HIV to immediately lose housing, up to 500 others to be at  
 18 high risk of losing housing, and approximately 3,300 such individuals to lose access to  
 19 critical medical and support services that help them navigate the challenges of living  
 20 with HIV.

22 b. A loss of Social Service Block Grants administered by ACF would lead to  
 23 thousands of Dane County’s most vulnerable residents losing access to meals, medical  
 24 care, housing, and other essential social services.

25 c. San Francisco would be unable to replace tens of millions of dollars in Title  
 26 IV-E foster care and adoption assistance funds administered by ACF, forcing it to end  
 27

1 payments to foster families and agencies that provide housing, care, and services to  
 2 approximately 500 children who cannot remain safely in their homes.

3       d.     Losing CDC funding would force Minneapolis to curtail emergency  
 4 preparedness work, including losing three of five staff members who work on the  
 5 program and severely impacting the City's capacity to prepare and respond to public  
 6 health emergencies like the COVID-19 pandemic.

7       e.     Similarly, reductions in CDC funding for HIV and sexually-transmitted  
 8 infection (STI) prevention and surveillance would lead to lay-offs and elimination of  
 9 programs, setting-back San Francisco's progress in addressing those public health  
 10 challenges. The resulting reduction in services would likely lead to increases in HIV  
 11 and syphilis infections as well as HIV and STI deaths.

12       f.     Loss of TANF block grants would significantly impact services available to  
 13 vulnerable populations in NYC, including vocational training for the unemployed and  
 14 underemployed; counseling, legal assistance, case management for survivors of  
 15 domestic violence, and rental and legal assistance for those facing eviction.

## 16           **II.       CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

17       1.     The Court has jurisdiction over Defendants and the subject matter of this action.  
 18 Plaintiffs' claims are not subject to the Tucker Act because the sources of their asserted rights are  
 19 the U.S. Constitution and statutes, including the Separation of Powers doctrine, the Spending  
 20 Clause, the Fifth Amendment's vagueness doctrine, the Tenth Amendment, and the Administrative  
 21 Procedure Act (APA). Moreover, the type of relief Plaintiffs seek is declaratory and injunctive,  
 22 precisely the kind of relief that is generally not available in the Court of Federal Claims. *See Doe*  
 23 *v. Tenet*, 329 F.3d 1135, 1141 (9th Cir. 2003).

1       2. Plaintiffs have standing to bring this suit. “A loss of funds promised under federal  
 2 law satisfies Article III’s standing requirement.” *City & Cnty. of S.F. v. Trump* (“*San Francisco*”),  
 3 897 F.3d 1225, 1235 (9th Cir. 2018); *see also Dep’t of Commerce v. New York*, 588 U.S. 752, 767  
 4 (2019). Here, Plaintiffs have been awarded, conditionally awarded, reasonably expect to be  
 5 awarded, or otherwise rely on federal grant funds that they could lose unless they accept unlawful  
 6 conditions that would dictate how they govern on matters of public concern. This imminent loss  
 7 of funds or infringement of rights is traceable to the conditions at issue and redressable by an order  
 8 barring their enforcement. *See Clapper v. Amnesty Int’l USA*, 568 U.S. 398, 409 (2013).

9  
 10     3. To obtain a preliminary injunction, the Plaintiffs must establish (1) they are likely  
 11 to succeed on the merits; (2) irreparable harm is likely in the absence of preliminary relief; (3) the  
 12 balance of equities tips in their favor; and (4) an injunction is in the public interest. *Winter v. Nat.*  
 13 *Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008); Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1).

14  
 15     4. There is a strong likelihood that the New CoC Plaintiffs will succeed on the merits  
 16 of their claims that the CoC Grant Conditions violate (1) the Constitution’s separation of powers  
 17 doctrine, *San Francisco*, 897 F.3d at 1234; (2) the Spending Clause, *S. Dakota v. Dole*, 483 U.S.  
 18 203, 207–08 (1987); (3) the Fifth Amendment’s vagueness doctrine; and (4) the APA, 5 U.S.C. §  
 19 706(2).

20  
 21     5. There is a strong likelihood that the HUD Plaintiffs will succeed on the merits of  
 22 their claims that the Non-CoC HUD Grant Conditions violate (1) the Constitution’s separation of  
 23 powers doctrine, *San Francisco*, 897 F.3d at 1234; (2) the Spending Clause, *Dole*, 483 U.S. at  
 24 207–08 (1987); (3) the Fifth Amendment’s vagueness doctrine; and (4) the APA, 5 U.S.C. §  
 25 706(2).

26     6. There is a strong likelihood that the DOT Plaintiffs will succeed on the merits of

their claims that the DOT Grant Conditions violate (1) the Constitution’s separation of powers doctrine, *San Francisco*, 897 F.3d at 1234; (2) the Spending Clause, *Dole*, 483 U.S. at 207–08; (3) the Fifth Amendment’s vagueness doctrine; (4) the Tenth Amendment, *Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius* (“NFIB”), 567 U.S. 519, 577–78 (2012); and (5) the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).

7. There is a strong likelihood that the HHS Plaintiffs will succeed on the merits of their claims that the HHS Grant Conditions violate (1) the Constitution’s separation of powers doctrine, *San Francisco*, 897 F.3d at 1234; (2) the Spending Clause, *Dole*, 483 U.S. at 207–08; (3) the Fifth Amendment’s vagueness doctrine; and (4) the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).

8. Plaintiffs have also shown that they are likely to suffer irreparable harm during the pendency of litigation in the absence of a preliminary injunction.

9. The balance of equities tips toward Plaintiffs and the public interest strongly weighs in favor of entering a preliminary injunction. Defendants have not posited any non-monetary harm they will experience if an injunction were to issue, and they have no legitimate interest in ensuring that funds are spent pursuant to conditions that were likely imposed in violation of the APA and the Constitution. *See Valle del Sol Inc. v. Whiting*, 732 F.3d 1006, 1029 (9th Cir. 2013) (there is no legitimate government interest in violating federal law).

10. The Court deems no security bond is required under Rule 65(c).

### III. ORDER

It is now, therefore, ORDERED as follows:

1. Plaintiffs' Third Motion for Preliminary Injunction is GRANTED;

2. HUD and its officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and any other persons who are in active concert or participation with them (collectively "Enjoined HUD CoC Parties"), are enjoined from (1) imposing or enforcing the CoC Grant Conditions, as defined in the

1 Appendix to this Order, or any materially similar terms or conditions at any stage of the grant-  
 2 making process, including but not limited to in new grant applications, notices of funding  
 3 availability or opportunity, certifications, grant agreements, or post-award submissions, with  
 4 respect to any CoC funds awarded to the New CoC Plaintiffs or members of their Continuums; (2)  
 5 as to the New CoC Plaintiffs or members of their Continuums, rescinding, withholding, cancelling,  
 6 or otherwise not processing any CoC Agreements, or pausing, freezing, impeding, blocking,  
 7 cancelling, terminating, delaying, withholding, or conditioning CoC funds, based on such terms or  
 8 conditions, including without limitation failing or refusing to process and otherwise implement  
 9 grants signed with changes or other objections to conditions enjoined by this preliminary  
 10 injunction; (3) requiring the New CoC Plaintiffs or members of their Continuums to make any  
 11 “certification” or other representation related to compliance with such terms or conditions; or (4)  
 12 refusing to issue, process, or sign CoC Agreements based on New CoC Plaintiffs’ participation in  
 13 this lawsuit;

16       3. The Enjoined HUD CoC Parties shall immediately treat any actions taken to  
 17 implement or enforce the CoC Grant Conditions or any materially similar terms or conditions as  
 18 to the New-CoC Plaintiffs or their Continuums, including but not limited to any delays or  
 19 withholding of funds based on such conditions, as null, void, and rescinded; while this PI is in  
 20 effect, shall treat as null and void any such conditions included in any grant agreement executed  
 21 by any New CoC Plaintiff or member of a New CoC Plaintiff’s Continuum; and may not  
 22 retroactively apply such conditions to grant agreements during the effective period of this PI. The  
 23 Enjoined HUD CoC Parties shall immediately take every step necessary to effectuate this order,  
 24 including without limitation clearing any administrative, operational, or technical hurdles to  
 25 implementation;

1       4.     HUD, all of the HUD program offices, and their officers, agents, servants,  
2 employees, and attorneys, and any other persons who are in active concert or participation with  
3 them (collectively “Enjoined HUD Parties”), are enjoined from (1) imposing or enforcing the Non-  
4 CoC HUD Grant Conditions, as defined in the Appendix to this Order, or any materially similar  
5 terms or conditions at any stage of the grant-making process, including but not limited to in new  
6 grant applications, notices of funding availability or opportunity, certifications, grant agreements,  
7 or post-award submissions, with respect to any non-CoC HUD funds awarded to the HUD  
8 Plaintiffs, their consortia, or their subrecipients; (2) as to the HUD Plaintiffs, their consortia, or  
9 their subrecipients, rescinding, withholding, cancelling, or otherwise not processing any non-CoC  
10 HUD awards, or pausing, freezing, impeding, blocking, cancelling, terminating, delaying,  
11 withholding, or conditioning non-CoC HUD funds, based on such terms or conditions, including  
12 without limitation failing or refusing to process and otherwise implement grants signed with  
13 changes or other objections to conditions enjoined by this preliminary injunction; (3) requiring the  
14 HUD Plaintiffs, their consortia, or their subrecipients to make any “certification” or other  
15 representation related to compliance with such terms or conditions; or (4) refusing to issue,  
16 process, or sign grant agreements based on HUD Plaintiffs’ participation in this lawsuit;

17       5.     The Enjoined HUD Parties shall immediately treat any actions taken to implement  
18 or enforce the Non-CoC HUD Grant Conditions or any materially similar terms or conditions as  
19 to the HUD Plaintiffs, their consortia, or their subrecipients, including but not limited to any  
20 delays or withholding of funds based on such conditions, as null, void, and rescinded; while this  
21 PI is in effect, shall treat as null and void any such conditions included in any grant agreement  
22 executed by any HUD Plaintiff, a member of its consortium, or its subrecipient; and may not  
23 retroactively apply such conditions to grant agreements during the effective period of this PI.  
24  
25

1 The Enjoined HUD Parties shall immediately take every step necessary to effectuate this order,  
2 including without limitation clearing any administrative, operational, or technical hurdles to  
3 implementation;

4       6. DOT, all of the DOT OAs, and their officers, agents, servants, employees, and  
5 attorneys, and any other persons who are in active concert or participation with them (collectively  
6 “Enjoined DOT Parties”), are enjoined from (1) imposing or enforcing the DOT Grant Conditions,  
7 as defined in the Appendix to this Order, or any materially similar terms or conditions at any stage  
8 of the grant-making process, including but not limited to in new grant applications, notices of  
9 funding availability or opportunity, certifications, grant agreements, or post-award submissions,  
10 as to any DOT funds awarded, directly or indirectly, to the New DOT Plaintiffs or their  
11 subrecipients; (2) as to the New DOT Plaintiffs or their subrecipients, rescinding, withholding,  
12 cancelling, or otherwise not processing the DOT grant awards, or pausing, freezing, impeding,  
13 blocking, canceling, terminating, delaying, withholding, or conditioning DOT funds, based on  
14 such terms or conditions, including without limitation failing or refusing to process and otherwise  
15 implement grants signed with changes or other objections to conditions enjoined by this  
16 preliminary injunction; (3) requiring the New DOT Plaintiffs or their subrecipients to make any  
17 “certification” or other representation related to compliance with such terms or conditions; or (4)  
18 refusing to issue, process, or sign grant agreements based on New DOT Plaintiffs’ participation in  
19 this lawsuit;

20       7. The Enjoined DOT Parties shall immediately treat any actions taken to implement  
21 or enforce the DOT Grant Conditions or any materially similar terms or conditions as to DOT  
22 funds awarded, directly or indirectly, to the New DOT Plaintiffs or their subrecipients, including  
23 but not limited to any delays or withholding of funds based on such conditions, as null, void, and  
24

1 resinded; while this PI is in effect, shall treat as null and void any such conditions included in any  
 2 grant agreement executed by any New DOT Plaintiff or its subrecipient; and may not retroactively  
 3 apply such conditions to grant agreements during the effective period of this PI. The Enjoined  
 4 DOT Parties shall immediately take every step necessary to effectuate this order, including without  
 5 limitation clearing any administrative, operational, or technical hurdles to implementation;

6       8.      HHS, all of the HHS operating divisions and agencies, and their officers, agents,  
 7 servants, employees, and attorneys, and any other persons who are in active concert or  
 8 participation with them (collectively “Enjoined HHS Parties”), are enjoined from (1) imposing or  
 9 enforcing the HHS Grant Conditions, as defined in the Appendix to this Order, or any materially  
 10 similar terms or conditions at any stage of the grant-making process, including but not limited to  
 11 in new grant applications, notices of funding availability or opportunity, certifications, grant  
 12 agreements, or post-award submissions, as to any HHS funds awarded, directly or indirectly, to  
 13 the HHS Plaintiffs or their subrecipients; (2) as to the HHS Plaintiffs or their subrecipients,  
 14 rescinding, withholding, cancelling, or otherwise not processing HHS grant awards, or pausing,  
 15 freezing, impeding, blocking, canceling, terminating, delaying, withholding, or conditioning  
 16 HHS funds, based on such terms or conditions, including without limitation failing or refusing to  
 17 process and otherwise implement grants signed with changes or other objections to conditions  
 18 enjoined by this preliminary injunction; (3) requiring the HHS Plaintiffs or their subrecipients to  
 19 make any “certification” or other representation related to compliance with such terms or  
 20 conditions; or (4) refusing to issue, process, or sign grant agreements based on HHS Plaintiffs’  
 21 participation in this lawsuit;

22       9.      The Enjoined HHS Parties shall immediately treat any actions taken to implement  
 23 or enforce the HHS Grant Conditions or any materially similar terms or conditions as to HHS  
 24

1 funds awarded, directly or indirectly, to the HHS Plaintiffs or their subrecipients, including but  
2 not limited to any delays or withholding of funds based on such conditions, as null, void, and  
3 rescinded; while this PI is in effect, shall treat as null and void any such conditions included in  
4 any grant agreement executed by any HHS Plaintiff or its subrecipient; and may not retroactively  
5 apply such conditions to grant agreements during the effective period of this PI. The Enjoined  
6 HHS Parties shall immediately take every step necessary to effectuate this order, including  
7 without limitation clearing any administrative, operational, or technical hurdles to  
8 implementation;

10 10. Defendants' counsel shall provide written notice of this Order to all Defendants and  
11 their employees by the end of the second day after issuance of this Order;

12 11. By the end of the second day after issuance of this Order, the Defendants SHALL  
13 FILE on the Court's electronic docket and serve upon Plaintiffs a Status Report documenting the  
14 actions that they have taken to comply with this Order, including a copy of the notice and an  
15 explanation as to whom the notice was sent;

17 12. This order remains in effect pending further orders from this Court.

19 Dated this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2025.

21 HONORABLE BARBARA J. ROTHSTEIN

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  

## APPENDIX

The “**CoC Grant Conditions**” enjoined by this Order are the following terms and conditions:

- The recipient or applicant shall not use grant funds to promote “gender ideology,” as defined in E.O. 14168, Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government;
- The recipient or applicant agrees that its compliance in all respects with all applicable Federal antidiscrimination laws is material to the U.S. Government’s payment decisions for purposes of section 3729(b)(4) of title 31, United States Code;
- The recipient or applicant certifies that it does not operate any programs that violate any applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964;
- The recipient or applicant shall not use any Grant Funds to fund or promote elective abortions, as required by E.O. 14182, Enforcing the Hyde Amendment;
- The recipient or applicant must administer its grant in accordance with all applicable immigration restrictions and requirements, including the eligibility and verification requirements that apply under title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, as amended (8 U.S.C. 1601-1646) (PRWORA) and any applicable requirements that HUD, the Attorney General, or the U.S. Center for Immigration Services [sic] may establish from time to time to comply with PRWORA, Executive Order 14218, or other Executive Orders or immigration laws;
- No state or unit of general local government that receives funding under this grant may use that funding in a manner that by design or effect facilitates the subsidization or promotion of illegal immigration or abets policies that seek to shield illegal aliens from deportation;
- Subject to the exceptions provided by PRWORA, the recipient or applicant must use SAVE, or an equivalent verification system approved by the Federal government, to prevent any Federal public benefit from being provided to an ineligible alien who entered the United States illegally or is otherwise unlawfully present in the United States;

1           – The recipient or applicant agrees that use of Grant Funds and its  
 2 operation of projects assisted with Grant Funds are governed by all  
 3 Executive Orders.

4           The “**Non-CoC HUD Grant Conditions**” enjoined by this Order are the following terms  
 5 and conditions:

6           – The recipient or applicant will not use Federal funding to promote  
 7 diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) mandates, policies, programs,  
 8 or activities that violate any applicable Federal antidiscrimination  
 9 laws;

10           – The recipient or applicant shall not use grant funds to promote  
 11 “gender ideology,” as defined in Executive Order (E.O.) 14168,  
 12 Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring  
 13 Biological Truth to the Federal Government;

14           – The recipient or applicant agrees that its compliance in all respects  
 15 with all applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws is material to the  
 16 U.S. Government’s payment decisions for purposes of section  
 17 3729(b)(4) of title 31, United States Code;

18           – The recipient or applicant certifies that it does not operate any  
 19 programs that violate any applicable Federal antidiscrimination  
 20 laws, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964;

21           – The recipient or applicant shall not use any grant funds to fund or  
 22 promote elective abortions, as required by E.O. 14182, Enforcing  
 23 the Hyde Amendment;

24           – The recipient or applicant must administer its grant in accordance  
 25 with all applicable immigration restrictions and requirements,  
 26 including the eligibility and verification requirements that apply  
 27 under title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity  
 Reconciliation Act of 1996, as amended (8 U.S.C. 1601-1646)  
 (PRWORA) and any applicable requirements that HUD, the  
 Attorney General, or the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
 may establish from time to time to comply with PRWORA,  
 Executive Order 14218, or other Executive Orders or immigration  
 laws;

– If applicable, no state or unit of general local government that  
 receives or applies for funding under this grant may use that funding  
 in a manner that by design or effect facilitates the subsidization or  
 promotion of illegal immigration or abets policies that seek to shield  
 illegal aliens from deportation;

- 1 – Unless excepted by PRWORA, the recipient or applicant must use  
2 SAVE, or an equivalent verification system approved by the Federal  
3 government, to prevent any Federal public benefit from being  
4 provided to an ineligible alien who entered the United States  
5 illegally or is otherwise unlawfully present in the United States.
- 6 – The recipient or applicant must comply with applicable existing and  
7 future Executive Orders, as advised by the Department, including  
8 but not limited to Executive Order 14182, Enforcing the Hyde  
9 Amendment; Executive Order 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination  
and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity; Executive Order 14168,  
Defending Women From Gender Ideology Extremism and  
Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government; and  
Executive Order 14151, Ending Radical and Wasteful Government  
DEI Programs and Preferencing.

10 The “**DOT Grant Conditions**” enjoined by this Order are the following terms and  
11 conditions:

- 12 – Pursuant to section (3)(b)(iv)(A), Executive Order 14173, *Ending*  
13 *Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity*, the  
14 recipient or applicant agrees that its compliance in all respects with  
15 all applicable Federal antidiscrimination laws is material to the  
government’s payment decisions for purposes of section 3729(b)(4)  
of title 31, United States Code;
- 16 – Pursuant to section (3)(b)(iv)(B), Executive Order 14173, *Ending*  
17 *Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity*, by  
18 entering into this Agreement, the recipient or applicant certifies that  
19 it does not operate any programs promoting diversity, equity, and  
inclusion (DEI) initiatives that violate any applicable Federal anti-  
discrimination laws;
- 20 – The recipient or applicant agrees to comply with executive orders,  
21 including but not limited to Executive Order 14168 titled Defending  
22 Women From Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring  
23 Biological Truth to the Federal Government, as they relate to the  
application, acceptance, and use of Federal funds for this project or  
grant;
- 24 – The recipient or applicant will cooperate with Federal officials in  
25 the enforcement of Federal law, including cooperating with and not  
impeding U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and  
26 other Federal offices and components of the Department of  
27 Homeland Security in the enforcement of Federal immigration law;

- 1 – The recipient or applicant will follow applicable federal laws  
2 pertaining to Subchapter 12, and be subject to the penalties set forth  
3 in 8 U.S.C. § 1324, Bringing in and harboring certain aliens, and 8  
4 U.S.C. § 1327, Aiding or assisting certain aliens to enter.
- 5 – The recipient or applicant must comply with other applicable federal  
6 nondiscrimination laws, regulations, and requirements, and follow  
7 federal guidance prohibiting discrimination;
- 8 – The recipient or applicant must comply with all applicable executive  
9 orders as they relate to the application, acceptance, and use of  
10 Federal funds for this Project;
- 11 – Performance under this agreement or application shall be governed  
12 by and in compliance with the following requirements, as  
13 applicable, to the type of organization of the recipient or applicant  
14 and any applicable sub-recipients. The applicable provisions to this  
15 agreement or application include, but are not limited to, the  
16 following: Bringing in and harboring certain aliens – 8 U.S.C. 1324;  
17 Aiding or assisting certain aliens to enter – 8 U.S.C. 1327; Executive  
18 Order 14151, Ending Radical and Wasteful Government DEI  
19 Programs and Preferencing; Executive Order 14168 Defending  
20 Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological  
21 Truth to the Federal Government; and Executive Order 14173,  
22 Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based  
23 Opportunity.

24 The “**HHS Grant Conditions**” enjoined by this Order are the following terms and  
25 conditions:

- 26 – The recipient or applicant must comply with all applicable Federal  
27 anti-discrimination laws material to the government’s payment  
decisions for purposes of 31 U.S.C. § 372(b)(4).
  - (1) Definitions. As used in this clause –
    - (a) DEI means “diversity, equity, and inclusion.”
    - (b) DEIA means “diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility.”
    - (c) Discriminatory equity ideology has the meaning set forth in  
Section 2(b) of Executive Order 14190 of January 29, 2025.

28 . . . .

1 (e) Federal anti-discrimination laws means Federal civil rights  
 2 law that protect individual Americans from discrimination on  
 3 the basis of race, color, sex, religion, and national origin.

4 (2) Grant award certification.

5 (a) By accepting the grant award, recipients are certifying that:

6 (i) They do not, and will not during the term of this financial  
 7 assistance award, operate any programs that advance or  
 8 promote DEI, DEIA, or discriminatory equity ideology in  
 9 violation of Federal anti-discrimination laws;

10 – By applying for or accepting federal funds from HHS, recipients  
 11 certify compliance with all federal antidiscrimination laws and these  
 12 requirements and that complying with those laws is a material  
 13 condition of receiving federal funding streams. Recipients are  
 14 responsible for ensuring subrecipients, contractors, and partners also  
 15 comply.

16 – All activities proposed in your application and budget narrative must  
 17 be in alignment with the current Executive Orders;

18 – Recipients are required to comply with all applicable Executive Orders;

19 – Funds cannot be used to support or provide services, either directly  
 20 or indirectly, to removable or illegal aliens;

21 – By accepting this award, including the obligation, expenditure, or  
 22 drawdown of award funds, recipients or applicants, whose  
 23 programs, are covered by Title IX certify as follows:

24 The recipient or applicant is compliant with Title IX of the  
 25 Education Amendments of 1972, as amended, 20 U.S.C. §§  
 26 1681 et seq., including the requirements set forth in Presidential  
 27 Executive Order 14168 titled Defending Women From Gender  
 Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the  
 Federal Government, and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of  
 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d et seq., and Recipient will remain  
 compliant for the duration of the Agreement.

The above requirements are conditions of payment that go the  
 essence of the Agreement and are therefore material terms of the  
 Agreement.

Payments under the Agreement are predicated on compliance  
 with the above requirements, and therefore the recipient or

1 applicant is not eligible for funding under the Agreement or to  
2 retain any funding under the Agreement absent compliance with  
the above requirements.

3 The recipient or applicant acknowledges that this certification  
4 reflects a change in the government's position regarding the  
5 materiality of the foregoing requirements and therefore any prior  
payment of similar claims does not reflect the materiality of the  
foregoing requirements to this Agreement.

6 The recipient or applicant acknowledges that a knowing false  
7 statement relating to recipient's or applicant's compliance with  
8 the above requirements and/or eligibility for the Agreement may  
9 subject the recipient or applicant to liability under the False  
Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729, and/or criminal liability,  
including under 18 U.S.C. §§ 287 and 1001.

1 Presented by:

2 PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP

3 /s/ Paul J. Lawrence

4 Paul J. Lawrence, WSBA #13557

5 Jamie Lisagor, WSBA #39946

6 Sarah S. Washburn, WSBA #44418

7 Meha Goyal, WSBA #56058

8 Galen Knowles, WSBA #59644

9 Luther Reed-Caulkins, WSBA #62513

10 *Attorneys for All Plaintiffs*

11 LEESA MANION

12 King County Prosecuting Attorney

13 /s/ David J. Hackett

14 David J. Hackett, WSBA #21234

15 Alison Holcomb, WSBA #23303

16 Erin Overbey, WSBA #21907

17 Cristy Craig, WSBA #27451

18 Donna Bond, WSBA #36177

19 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Martin Luther*

20 *King, Jr. County*

21 JASON J. CUMMINGS

22 Snohomish County Prosecuting Attorney

23 /s/ Bridget E. Casey

24 Bridget E. Casey, WSBA #30459

25 Rebecca J. Guadamud, WSBA #39718

26 Rebecca E. Wendling, WSBA #35887

27 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Snohomish County*

28 DAVID CHIU

29 San Francisco City Attorney

30 /s/ David Chiu

31 David Chiu (CA Bar No. 189542)

32 Yvonne R. Meré (CA Bar No. 175394)

33 Mollie M. Lee (CA Bar No. 251404)

34 Sara J. Eisenberg (CA Bar No. 269303)

35 Ronald H. Lee (CA Bar No. 238720)

36 Alexander J. Holtzman (CA Bar No. 311813)

37 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs City and County of*

38 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' THIRD MOTION FOR  
39 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION - 43

40 No. 2:25-cv-00814-BJR

PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP  
401 UNION STREET  
SUITE 1600  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-2668  
TELEPHONE: (206) 245-1700  
FACSIMILE: (206) 245-1750

1 *San Francisco, San Francisco County*  
2 *Transportation Authority, and Treasure*  
3 *Island Mobility Management Agency*

4  
5 OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL,  
6 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
*/s/ Tony LoPresti*  
Tony LoPresti (CA Bar No. 289269)  
Kavita Narayan (CA Bar No. 264191)  
Meredith A. Johnson (CA Bar No. 291018)  
Stefanie L. Wilson (CA Bar No. 314899)  
Cara H. Sandberg (CA Bar No. 291058)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff County of Santa Clara*

10  
11 ADAM CEDERBAUM  
12 Corporation Counsel, City of Boston

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
*/s/ Samantha H. Fuchs*  
Samantha H. Fuchs (MA BBO No. 708216)  
Samuel B. Dinning (MA BBO No. 704304)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Boston*

10  
11 CITY OF COLUMBUS, DEPARTMENT OF LAW  
12 ZACH KLEIN, CITY ATTORNEY

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
*/s/ Richard N. Coglianese*  
Richard N. Coglianese (OH Bar No. 0066830)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff City of Columbus*

10  
11 PUBLIC RIGHTS PROJECT

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
*/s/ Sharanya Mohan*  
Sharanya (Sai) Mohan (CA Bar No. 350675)  
Naomi Tsu (OR Bar No. 242511)  
Toby Merrill (MA Bar No. 601071)  
*Counsel for Plaintiffs City of Columbus, City*  
*& County of Denver, Metro Government of*  
*Nashville & Davidson County, Pima County,*  
*County of Sonoma, City of Bend, City of*  
*Cambridge, City of Chicago, City of Culver*  
*City, City of Minneapolis, City of Pasadena,*  
*City of Pittsburgh, City of Portland, City of*

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' THIRD MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION - 44  
No. 2:25-cv-00814-BJR

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP  
401 UNION STREET  
SUITE 1600  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-2668  
TELEPHONE: (206) 245-1700  
FACSIMILE: (206) 245-1750

*San José, City of Santa Monica, City of Tucson, City of Wilsonville, Santa Monica Housing Authority, County of Alameda, City of Albuquerque, Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, City of Bellevue, City of Bellingham, City of Bremerton, County of Dane, City of Eugene, City of Healdsburg, County of Hennepin, Kitsap County, City of Los Angeles, City of Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, Multnomah County, City of Oakland, City of Pacifica, City of Petaluma, Ramsey County, City of Rochester, City of Rohnert Park, San Mateo County, City of Santa Rosa, City of Watsonville, Culver City Housing Authority, Puget Sound Regional Council, Sonoma County Transportation Authority, and Sonoma County Community Development Commission*

MURIEL GOODE-TRUFANT  
Corporation Counsel of the City of New York

/s/ Doris Bernhardt  
Doris Bernhardt (NY Bar No. 4449385)  
Joshua P. Rubin (NY Bar No. 2734051)  
Aatif Iqbal (NY Bar No. 5068515)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of New York*

ASHLEY M. KELLIHER  
DAVID P. STEINBERGER  
Assistant City Attorneys

/s/ Ashley M. Kelliher  
Ashley M. Kelliher (CO Bar No. 40220)  
David P. Steinberger (CO Bar No. 48530)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City and County of Denver*

LAURA CONOVER  
Pima County Attorney

/s/ *Bobby Yu*  
Samuel E. Brown (AZ Bar No. 027474)  
Bobby Yu (AZ Bar No. 031237)  
Kyle Johnson (AZ Bar No. 032908)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff Pima County*

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' THIRD MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION - 45  
No. 2:25-cv-00814-BJR

1 ROBERT H. PITTMAN, County Counsel  
2

3 /s/ Joshua A. Myers

4 Joshua A. Myers (CA Bar No. 250988)  
5 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs County of  
Sonoma, Sonoma County Transportation  
Authority, and Sonoma County  
Community Development Commission*

6  
7 OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY  
8 FOR THE CITY OF BEND

9 /s/ Ian M. Leitheiser

10 Ian M. Leitheiser (OSB #993106)  
11 Elizabeth Oshel (OSB #104705)  
Michael J. Gaffney (OSB #251680)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Bend*

12 CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, LAW DEPARTMENT  
13 MEGAN B. BAYER, CITY SOLICITOR

14 /s/ Megan B. Bayer

15 Megan B. Bayer (MA BBO No. 669494)  
16 Elliott J. Veloso (MA BBO No. 677292)  
Diane Pires (MA BBO No. 681713)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Cambridge*

17 MARY B. RICHARDSON-LOWRY  
18 Corporation Counsel of the City of Chicago

19 /s/ Rebecca Hirsch

20 Rebecca Hirsch (IL Bar No. 6279592)  
Chelsey Metcalf (IL Bar No. 6337233)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Chicago*

22 KRISTYN ANDERSON  
23 City Attorney

24 /s/ Kristyn Anderson

25 Kristyn Anderson (MN Lic. 0267752)  
Sara J. Lathrop (MN Lic. 0310232)  
Munazza Humayun (MN Lic. 0390788)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Minneapolis*

27 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' THIRD MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION - 46

No. 2:25-cv-00814-BJR

PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP  
401 UNION STREET  
SUITE 1600  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-2668  
TELEPHONE: (206) 245-1700  
FACSIMILE: (206) 245-1750

1 KRYSIA KUBIAK, Esq.

2 City Solicitor

3 /s/ Julie E. Koren

4 Julie E. Koren (PA Bar No. 309642)

5 *Counsel for Plaintiff City of Pittsburgh*

6 ROBERT TAYLOR

7 Portland City Attorney

8 /s/ Caroline Turco

9 Caroline Turco (OR Bar No. 083813)

10 *Attorney for Plaintiff City of Portland*

11 NORA FRIMANN

12 City Attorney

13 /s/ Nora Frimann

14 Nora Frimann (CA Bar No. 93249)

15 Elisa Tolentino (CA Bar No. 245962)

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiff City of San José*

17 CITY OF WILSONVILLE

18 /s/ Amanda R. Guile-Hinman

19 Amanda R. Guile-Hinman, WSBA #46282

20 *Attorneys for the City of Wilsonville*

21 CENTRAL PUGET SOUND REGIONAL  
22 TRANSIT AUTHORITY

23 /s/ Andrés Muñoz

24 Andrés Muñoz, WSBA #50224

25 Desmond Brown, WSBA #16232

26 *Attorneys for the Central Puget Sound  
27 Regional Transit Authority*

28 LAW, LYMAN, DANIEL, KAMERRER

29 & BOGDANOVICH, P.S.

30 /s/ Jeffrey S. Myers

31 Jeffrey S. Myers, WSBA #16390

32 Erin L. Hillier, WSBA #42883

33 Jakub Kocztorz, WSBA #61393

34 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Intercity Transit*

35 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' THIRD MOTION FOR  
36 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION - 47

37 No. 2:25-cv-00814-BJR

PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP  
401 UNION STREET  
SUITE 1600  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-2668  
TELEPHONE: (206) 245-1700  
FACSIMILE: (206) 245-1750

PORT OF SEATTLE  
Anderson & Kreiger LLP

/s/ Melissa C. Allison  
Melissa C. Allison (MA Bar No. 657470)  
David S. Mackey (MA Bar No. 542277)  
Christina S. Marshall (MA Bar No. 688348)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff Port of Seattle and  
Milwaukee County*

# KING COUNTY REGIONAL HOMELESSNESS AUTHORITY

/s/ Edmund Witter  
Edmund Witter, WSBA #52339  
Attorneys for Plaintiff King County Regional  
Homelessness Authority

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL,  
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

/s/ Donna R. Ziegler  
Donna R. Ziegler (CA Bar No. 142415)  
K. Scott Dickey (CA Bar No. 184251)  
Jason M. Allen (CA Bar No. 284432)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff County of Alameda*

## CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

/s/ Lauren Keefe  
Lauren Keefe, City Attorney (NM Lic. 14664)  
Devon P. King, Deputy City Attorney (NM Lic. 148108)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Albuquerque*

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY  
Trisna Tanus, City Attorney

/s/ Trisna Tanus  
Trisna Tanus, WSBA #46568  
Chad R. Barnes, WSBA #30480  
Katherine B. White, WSBA #46649  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Bellevue*

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' THIRD MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION - 48  
No. 2:25-cv-00814-BJR

PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP  
401 UNION STREET  
SUITE 1600  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-2668  
TELEPHONE: (206) 245-1700  
FACSIMILE: (206) 245-1750

1 CITY OF BELLINGHAM

2 /s/ Sarah W. Chaplin

3 Sarah W. Chaplin, WSBA #51642

4 *Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Bellingham*

5 BREMERTON CITY ATTORNEY

6 /s/ Kylie J. Finnell

7 Kylie J. Finnell, WSBA #34997

8 Brett Jette, WSBA #47903

9 *Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Bremerton*

10 OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION

11 COUNSEL FOR DANE COUNTY

12 /s/ Carlos A. Pabellon

13 Carlos A. Pabellon (WI State Bar No. 1046945)

14 David R. Gault (WI State Bar No. 1016374)

15 *Attorneys for Plaintiff County of Dane*

16 CITY OF EUGENE

17 /s/ Mark Kannen

18 Mark Kannen (OSB 120999)

19 Kathryn P. Brotherton (OSB 981530)

20 *Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Eugene*

21 BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP

22 /s/ Samantha W. Zutler

23 Samantha W. Zutler (CA Bar No. 238514)

24 Eileen L. Ollivier (CA Bar No. 345880)

25 *Attorney for Plaintiffs City of Healdsburg  
and City of Watsonville*

26 BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP

27 /s/ Michelle Marchetta Kenyon

28 Michelle Marchetta Kenyon (CA Bar No. 127969)

29 Eileen L. Ollivier (CA Bar No. 345880)

30 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs City of Pacifica  
and City of Rohnert Park*

31 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' THIRD MOTION FOR  
32 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION - 49

33 No. 2:25-cv-00814-BJR

34 PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP  
35 401 UNION STREET  
36 SUITE 1600  
37 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-2668  
38 TELEPHONE: (206) 245-1700  
39 FACSIMILE: (206) 245-1750

1 MARY F. MORIARTY  
2 Hennepin County Attorney

3 /s/ Rebecca Holschuh  
4 Rebecca L.S. Holschuh (MN Bar No. 0392251)  
5 Brittany K. McCormick (MN Bar No. 0395175)  
6 *Attorneys for Plaintiff County of Hennepin*

7 KITSAP COUNTY

8 /s/ Kyla S. Bond  
9 Kyla S. Bond, WSBA #48309  
10 *Attorney for Plaintiff Kitsap County*

11 HYDEE FELDSTEIN SOTO  
12 City Attorney of the City of Los Angeles

13 /s/ Michael J. Dundas  
14 Michael J. Dundas (CA Bar No. 226930)  
15 Adrienne S. Khorasanee (CA Bar No. 227704)  
16 Joshua M. Templet (CA Bar No. 267098)  
17 *Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Los Angeles*

18 MULTNOMAH COUNTY

19 /s/ B. Andrew Jones  
20 B. Andrew Jones (OSB No. 091786)  
21 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Multnomah County*

22 CITY OF OAKLAND

23 /s/ Ryan Richardson  
24 Ryan Richardson (CA Bar No. 223548)  
25 Maria Bee (CA Bar No. 167716)  
26 Jaime Huling Delaye (CA Bar No. 270784)  
27 H. Luke Edwards (CA Bar No. 313756)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Oakland*

28 CITY OF PETALUMA

29 /s/ Eric Danly  
30 Eric Danly (CA Bar No. 201621)  
31 *Attorney for Plaintiff City of Petaluma*

32 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' THIRD MOTION FOR  
33 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION - 50  
34 No. 2:25-cv-00814-BJR

35 PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP  
36 401 UNION STREET  
37 SUITE 1600  
38 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-2668  
39 TELEPHONE: (206) 245-1700  
40 FACSIMILE: (206) 245-1750

1 JOHN J. CHOI  
2 RAMSEY COUNTY ATTORNEY

3 /s/ Bradley Cousins  
4 Bradley Cousins (MN Bar No. 0400463)  
5 Stacey D'Andrea (MN Bar No. 0388320)  
6 Jada Lewis (MN Bar No. 0391287)  
7 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Ramsey County*

8 CITY OF ROCHESTER

9 /s/ Patrick Beath  
10 Patrick Beath, Corporation Counsel (NY Lic. 4999751)  
11 *Attorney for Plaintiff City of Rochester*

12 HEATHER FERBERT  
13 City Attorney

14 /s/ Mark Ankcorn  
15 Mark Ankcorn (CA Bar No. 166871)  
16 Julie Rau (CA Bar No. 317658)  
17 *Attorneys for Plaintiff City of San Diego*

18 SAN MATEO COUNTY

19 /s/ John D. Nibbelin  
20 John D. Nibbelin (CA Bar No. 184603)  
21 Rebecca M. Archer (CA Bar No. 202743)  
22 Lauren F. Carroll (CA Bar No. 333446)  
23 *Attorneys for Plaintiff San Mateo County*

24 CITY OF SANTA ROSA

25 /s/ Teresa L. Stricker  
26 Teresa L. Stricker (CA Bar No. 160601)  
27 Autumn Luna (CA Bar No. 288506)  
Adam S. Abel (CA Bar No. 148210)  
Hannah E. Ford-Stille (CA Bar No. 335113)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Santa Rosa*

28 CASCADIA LAW GROUP PLLC

29 /s/ Stephen R. Parkinson

30 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' THIRD MOTION FOR  
31 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION - 51  
32 No. 2:25-cv-00814-BJR

33 PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP  
34 401 UNION STREET  
35 SUITE 1600  
36 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-2668  
37 TELEPHONE: (206) 245-1700  
38 FACSIMILE: (206) 245-1750

1 Stephen R. Parkinson, WSBA #21111  
2 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Puget Sound Regional Council*

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' THIRD MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION - 52  
No. 2:25-cv-00814-BJR

PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP  
401 UNION STREET  
SUITE 1600  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-2668  
TELEPHONE: (206) 245-1700  
FACSIMILE: (206) 245-1750